





# EULOGIUM

UPON

## WILBERFORCE;

WITH

**A Brief Incidental Review of the Subject of Colonization.**

DELIVERED,

AT THE REQUEST OF THE ABOLITION SOCIETY,

MARCH 10, 1834,

BY

DAVID PAUL BROWN.

---

**PHILADELPHIA:**

PRINTED BY T. K. COLLINS & CO.

49 PRUNE STREET.

1834.



## EULOGIUM.

BIOGRAPHY is individual history, as distinguished from that of communities, of nations, and of worlds. Eulogy is that deserved applause which springs from the virtues and attaches itself to the characters of men. With this understanding, perhaps, there is no more illustrious subject of encomium—none more largely entitled to, and none *less* requiring the voice of praise—than William Wilberforce. One whose practical benevolence was its own best monument—whose wide spread philanthropy, while it acknowledged no limits but the boundaries of the world, the melancholy sphere to which human action is confined, operated upon principles as extensive—as immutable—as eternal as truth itself. It is not to reward him—for if private and public worth be an earnest of future bliss, he has already received an unearthly reward in the bosom of his Saviour—but it is to inculcate upon others the moral beauty and value of his example, that we, my fellow-citizens, have this day assembled. His benignant spirit, removed from a state of temporal warfare and temporal sorrow to the realms of the just made perfect, looks down from its blessed abode upon his disciples in the great cause of human freedom, and lights, and leads, and lures them on, to the accomplishment of that immortal work, which he himself so gloriously begun—so devotedly pursued—so extensively achieved.

To commemorate such a man, is not so essential to the preservation of his fame, as to that of those who have enjoyed the benefit of his magnanimous struggles against unsanctified oppression, and in whom a want of desert may fairly be inferred, from an omission to express their gratitude upon an occasion so peculiarly appropriate as the present.

Of the private or domestic life of Wilberforce nothing is requisite to be said. A public servant may be said to have no private life. The feelings and principles manifested by his arduous political career, while they show how little opportunity remained to him for the enjoyment of social and domestic peace, bear unequivocal evidence of a heart replete with every moral and intellectual refinement and excellence that could contribute to strengthen and improve those sacred ties, which at the same time bind the virtuous to the strict performance of their relative duties *here*, and through those, to the fulfilment of the obligations which they owe to the great *hereafter*. It is unnecessary to attempt tracing the sympathies of the human heart, in their diversified and complicated exercise around the family fireside, or throughout an extensive circle of tender relatives and devoted friends; it is unnecessary to rend the veil from the kind communion of kindred spirits, and to calculate the vast sum of human worth and enjoyment, by throwing into the account the mutual courtesies, kindnesses, and benefactions, by which the wise and the virtuous are ever united together. All these may readily be inferred, and must suffer in their description, from the regular, uniform, and consistent denotements of Christian charity and benevolence. Men may, it is true, in all their familiar and friendly intercourse, faithfully perform every duty incumbent upon them in those relations, because character, inter-

est and duty all combine to promote that performance; yet when those motives are wanting—when the objects to which the mind is directed are beyond the pale of habitual, selfish, or natural claims—the heart may prove as cold and cheerless as the mountain snow. The converse of this proposition, however, is not true. The breast that glows with indignation at the unmerited oppression of a forlorn and helpless fellow-creature—that melts with sorrow at the hapless tale of woe—that spontaneously prompts the vindication of the violated rights of humanity, in whatever form or complexion, or under whatever plea or pretext they may have been invaded—that breast is the hallowed abode of all the best affections of our fallen nature, and requires no argument to show, that feelings thus radiated and diffused, like the genial rays of the sun, when once converged or concentrated, become, if possible, infinitely more fervent and powerful in their influence. Public devotedness to the happiness of mankind is the best voucher for practical fidelity in the discharge of the humbler and more private virtues.

I speak, then, to his outward and visible life; to his self-dedication; not to selfish or individual triumphs, but to the great objects of universal emancipation; to his continued and unwearied struggles in behalf of those who were incapable of struggling for themselves—who were borne down by the galling chains of unqualified servitude, and the still more galling anathemas of savage and remorseless men. In such a contest, what could sustain him? nothing but the buoyant consciousness of undeviating rectitude; for such an effort what could reward him? nothing but the cheering smiles of approving heaven *here*, and its measureless glories *hereafter*. The objects of his bounty were those from whom he could expect no return; they were of the proscribed

and outlawed race ; and even while asserting their violated rights, he himself, in the eye of their oppressors (at one time composing a majority of the world), was condemned to share in their odium, and almost partake of their penalties. It required no ordinary mind, no common-place influences, thus at the same time to despise the lures of ambition, and to encounter the shafts of prejudice and pride in behalf of a race of men, who, fettered themselves, could impart no aid to the conflict, no consolations to the vanquished, no trophies to the victor.

Thousands there are, we admit, who, for the gratification of aspiring views, from love of glory or from the fear of shame, have sought the bubble reputation, even in the cannon's mouth. Admiring nations and astonished worlds witnessed their proud exploits, and, applauding the motives in the act, manifested their own desire of ostentation, by lavishing upon their benefactors with a prodigal hand the rewards of deathless honour. But what laurels shall spring from the barren and arid soil of Africa ? What rewards shall her benighted and enslaved children bestow to repay past exertion, or stimulate to new efforts in their degraded cause, while every where confronted by danger—every where disheartened by dismay ? For such devotion there can be but one motive—whose sovereign and holy influence I trust you all now feel, as it was felt by your great exemplar—that motive is sympathy ;—there can be but one reward, and that is, the blessing of the bleeding and broken heart, upon which your souls shall be wafted to the presence of their God.

From the proud outline of his general character, let us trace him briefly through the details of life, by which this character was created and secured. We pause not to inquire to whom related or by whom begot.



He shone in original and not borrowed lustre, and the mild and mellowed radiance of his nature gilded the earth's darkest and extremest verge. Though not ennobled by princes, he was nature's nobleman, and looked down upon the sickly minions of royalty in the lofty aristocracy of exalted worth. I confess it moves me to ineffable scorn, even to suppose that titles, and stars, and garters, could dignify such a man. His proud title was that of *a man and a brother*. His star was brighter than the celestial stars in Orion's belt—it was the Star of Bethlehem.

He was born in 1759. He died in 1833. Of some men, perhaps, such would be the best epitaph; but with him, the vast interval of time afforded by these remote extremes, was marked in all its stages by daily sacrifices of personal interest to the common good, in the constant and indefatigable application to the great cause of universal freedom. All the energies of his well-stored mind were absorbed in that ruling passion. It was not in parliament alone, while seconded by the argumentative powers of Fox, the dignity and eloquence of Pitt, the erudition of Burke, and the refined wit of Sheridan, that he presented himself as the champion of the whole African race, but in the hours of retirement and ordinary repose; while less wary and less faithful sentinels either betrayed their trust or slept upon their post, he stood alone, armed cap-a-pie, in the very portal of Liberty, with an eye that never winked, and a soul that never tired; and, like night's sentinel, Silence, challenged every sound. With him the watchword ever was—"Am I not a man and a brother?"

Mr. Wilberforce entered parliament in the year 1781, and from that time until the termination of his earthly career, few of the public men in Great Britain enjoyed a higher reputation for talents, and assuredly no one

occupied loftier ground on the score of political honesty and consistency. The force of his character was necessarily infused into every thing that he said, and in itself was sufficient always to secure the attention and admiration both of friends and foes. But, independently of that, although certainly not blessed with an exterior of great personal dignity, in the animation and excitement of debate his diminutive form was utterly forgotten, in witnessing the towering and gigantic proportions of his mind. His eloquence, though not of the most overwhelming, was of the most conciliatory and agreeable order; no man came into a discussion with an intellect more richly stored, and no one possessed the faculty of more successfully imparting his views to others. While almost all of the illustrious men of his time occasionally fell from the exalted sphere in which they were designed to move, and, like erratic meteors, were sometimes marked in their progress by pestilence and death, Wilberforce stood as a fixed star, and grew brighter as the political tempest darkened.

With such a character, with such qualifications, it is not a subject of wonder that, in the very dawning of his career, he should have been chosen by the philanthropic Clarkson for the arduous and godlike purpose of asserting and maintaining the inalienable rights of man.

In the year 1789, Mr. Wilberforce, having previously apprised the House of Commons of his design, moved the consideration of the subject of the slave trade; and, after discussing its injustice, cruelty, and impolicy, in a most masterly speech, he concluded with these remarks, not more applicable to that time than to the present, and which manifest the spirit by which all his future efforts were characterized:—"Policy, however, sir, is not my principle, and I am not ashamed to say

it. There is a principle above every thing that is political; and when I reflect upon the command, ‘Thou shalt do no murder,’ believing the authority to be divine, how can I dare to set up any reasonings of my own against it. And, sir, when we think of eternity, and of the future consequences of all human conduct, what is there in this life that should make any man contradict the dictates of his conscience, the principles of justice, the views of religion and of God?”

At the period of making this famous speech, Mr. Wilberforce was not thirty years old; and when it is borne in mind that there never was, before or since, in the British parliament, such overpowering talent as it then boasted, the effort, taking into view the years of the speaker, and the difficulties encountered, was as extraordinary as it was eventually successful. Burke—than whom there could be no more competent judge—observed in reply, that “the house, the whole nation, and all Europe, were under serious obligations to the gentleman for having brought the subject forward in a manner the most masterly, impressive and eloquent.”

Fox and Pitt were also warm in their encomiums—and both pronounced the question to be one between humanity and interest, averring that nothing could be more disgraceful than for the house to decide against abolition upon the principles of interest, unless they had the courage to avow that interest was their motive. Mr. Marsham having denied that it was a question between humanity on one side and interest on the other, Mr. William Smith aptly remarked in reply, that Mr. Marsham was undoubtedly right—for interest and humanity were both on the same side, and equally in favour of abolition.

The talents of Sheridan were also enlisted to stifle this growing evil, which he averred to consist in the

exercise of a power by the West India merchants, which no man ought to have over another.

With the aid of such men, Mr. Wilberforce had nothing to fear, and from time to time during the progress of their lives, for he survived them all, they cordially co-operated with him in this magnificent scheme of human liberty, until at last heaven blessed it with deserved success.

It is unnecessary to trace these immortal men through the difficulties, opposition and reproaches which they encountered for nearly twenty years, in the prosecution of their magnanimous scheme. The parliamentary debates are thronged with their almost unparalleled and entirely unanswerable arguments for the abolition of slavery. Wilberforce was ever at the head—like Antæus, with every successive fall he gained new strength—and exulting in the purity of his motives, he enjoyed half the triumph of success even in the consternation of defeat. Never, I take leave to assert, and I do it advisedly, never, upon any occasion, while he was in the house, was the subject of abolition directly or incidentally introduced, without its immediately receiving his enthusiastic support. In all the fluctuations of government—in all the vicissitudes of a diversified policy—he in this respect was ever the same; no change could change his steadfastness of soul.

But, as has been said, it was not in parliament only that he displayed his devotion to this cause. While retired from the bustle and the cares of public life, this was still the subject that engrossed his thoughts. Volumes, which bespeak at the same time the most comprehensive genius, the most untiring industry, the most self-denying and zealous dedication to the emancipation of the slave, may every where be traced

to Wilberforce. His treatise upon slavery, which is an elaborate work in itself, constitutes but a small portion of those compositions by which he contrived to mould the public mind into a state of adaptation to the various phases exhibited from time to time by the proposed reform.

Nor is it to be understood that he neglected other political duties in the performance of this. The uninterrupted fidelity of his constituents for half a century—the fact of their being the most refined and intellectual portion of the British population—the expenditure voluntarily incurred by them upon one occasion to secure his election, which is said to have exceeded one hundred thousand pounds sterling—furnish ample testimonials of the devotedness of the people and the worth of their representative. But, apart from those matters of inference, we have the ocular proof, exhibited by the history of parliament, of the most sedulous and scrupulous discharge of his obligations. He was truly the representative of the people; he was wedded to no party; he was at times enlisted in aid of the ministry, at others against it; but the tie that bound him was ever that of patriotism and principle. He advocated the termination of the American war; opposed Mr. Fox's famous East India bill; aided in all attempts at beneficial parliamentary reform; struggled nobly, though unsuccessfully, for the melioration of the criminal code of Great Britain; and, in short, without tracing him step by step through his brilliant, useful, and honourable career, was in all changes and vicissitudes the firm and undeviating friend of man.

As the reward of this truly exemplary course, the eyes of the whole realm were directed to him in every period of emergency; and although success did not always crown his magnanimous efforts in behalf of the

injured and oppressed, yet he still never shrunk or blenched under the influence of disappointment and despair, but zealously persevered, till the last lingering hope was extinct. To say of such a man that he was a practical Christian, a devout follower of the blessed cross, is but to sum up in a word the long line of his progressive and accumulated virtues. His works were here—but he looked for his reward to a throne not made with hands—eternal in the heavens.

Among the last acts of his valuable life, in the month of July, 1833, together with Lushington, Suffield, Cropper, M'Caully and others, rendered illustrious by their steadfast devotion to emancipation, he issued his protest against the colonization of Liberia, and all contribution to its support—alleging it to have been formed to indulge the prejudices of American slave-holders, and to be regarded with aversion by the coloured population of the United States. In this protest colonization is further said to be an obstruction to the extirpation of slavery—its pretexts delusive—rooted in prejudice against the blacks, subjecting them, free and slave, to practical persecution in order to force them to emigrate; and finally calculated to swallow up or divert the feeling which America, as a Christian and free country, cannot but entertain, that slavery is alike incompatible with the laws of God and the well-being of man. For these reasons they repudiate its principles, and declare it in their estimation not deserving of the countenance of the British public. This protest at once suggests to the mind considerations even more important than the subject with reference to which we have ostensibly convened.

But, however distinguished this authority, let us pause here for a moment, while we inquire into the character of the protest, and the conflict between the

friends of abolition and colonization, out of which it arises. Unquestionable as may be the motives of those illustrious men, and extensive as may have been their experience and intelligence upon subjects of this nature, it is still not for us blindly to adopt their opinions, but, with all becoming reverence for their superior acquirements, to examine with scrupulous care the basis of their determination, and then to decide as belongs to our best impressions, and the magnitude of the great cause in which we are engaged.

Are we prepared to adopt the language of this protest, however powerfully recommended? This is matter of deep concernment, and should be deliberately considered. Before we determine upon it, let us take a hasty glance at the fundamental principles of those respective institutions—I say their principles, not the men, much less the professions of those men, by whom they are sustained. These are subjects which, although much talked of, are but little understood; and it is very possible that I myself may not be considered entitled to entire exemption from the imputation of ignorance which these expressions appear to convey. Be it so; I profess but little practical knowledge upon the subject, and lay claim to no superiority of information beyond that, the necessity for which the allotment of this day's duties imperatively imposed, and which, in similar circumstances, any other individual might have readily acquired. So far as the friends of both systems have been able to supply information, it has been supplied, and, consistently with the time afforded, carefully and impartially considered.

In approaching this subject, let us be as dispassionate as possible. There can be no advantage derived from indulging sinful tempers or launching into invectives or abuse. These experiments belong to other subjects,

but are utterly inconsistent with the magnitude and character of this. Great severity has been indulged in by the advocates and friends of these respective institutions, and therefore it is probable that, in the course proposed by me to be pursued, I shall gratify neither. This, however it may be regretted, shall not deter me from frankly and mildly expressing my views, which will at least impart to me the satisfaction that must ever arise from a conscientious discharge of duty—a consolation which the world with all its flattering illusions can never give—a consolation which the frowns or maledictions of that world can never take away.

The Abolition Society was founded in the year 1774, and enrolls upon its records many of the most distinguished and philanthropic men that have been produced by this or any other country. Franklin, Morris, Wistar, Rush, Lewis, Wilberforce, and the venerable gentleman who at this time presides over its councils and its interests, and whose name is in itself a tower of strength, bear ample testimony to the solidity and purity of those views by which its operations were to be directed. The express objects, as exhibited upon the face of the subsequent charter, were the promotion of the abolition of slavery, and the melioration of the condition of the free coloured population throughout the United States, together with the relief of such as were unlawfully held in bondage. These essentially are the ground-works also of the various anti-slavery societies in this country.

Under the influence of this Society, aided by the solemn convictions of the country, and the spirit of the government, which, though for a time it may slumber, we trust will never die, slavery has already been extirpated from at least one half of the confederated states. The march of its influence is onward still,



and though its step may be stealthy and inaudible as that of time, acquiring strength in its progress, with the light of heaven upon its head, and the peace of heaven at its heart, it must finally overcome all the powers of opposition, though marshalled and led on by the prince of darkness himself.

The Colonization Society, whatever may appear to be its tendency, we are also inclined to suppose, originated in the desire to improve the condition of this afflicted race. The respectable and even distinguished advocates who from time to time have enlisted themselves beneath its banner, forbid us for a moment to suspect that it was ever premeditated as a means of promoting slavery, or what is the same thing, impeding the advance of abolition. I mean to say, such was not the mutual understanding of the spirit of the compact. We cannot, we dare not suppose it, in common justice to our fellow men, to say nothing of the reciprocal extension of Christian charity which such a cause emphatically demands. That wicked and designing individuals, unfit for the holy service in which they profess to be engaged, may sometimes sway and swerve it to their own sordid purposes, or that headlong zealots may overstep the bounds of reason, and thereby produce a pernicious reaction upon the objects of the institution, serves but to show that the performance of this heavenly work is necessarily entrusted to the imperfection of human agency, necessarily subjected to the influence of human passion. The sinner that hypocritically assumes the garb of the saint, may bring the saint himself into suspicion, but still, never should be permitted to impair the sacred sanctions of religion, or pollute her immaculate altar.

Morally, therefore, I say, they may stand justified to themselves, but I deny that that which is morally right

is invariably expedient. If morality were infallible in itself, or did not vary in its standard according to the different grades of intelligence, or the influence of circumstances ; if, in short, it were the same in all men, why then indeed morals and expediency would move together,

Like Juno's swans,  
Forever coupled and inseparable.

But talk as we will, it never was, and never can be so ; and therefore it not unfrequently happens that, with the best intentions, entirely vindicated to ourselves, we may, from want of opportunities of knowledge, or from inconsiderate rashness, or, as more often happens, from overweening zeal in a righteous cause, be guilty of most grievous though unintentional wrong to others, even while all our efforts are exercised for their imaginary protection and advantage. I do not mean to say, now, that these remarks are applicable to the Colonization Society: we ought not to be permitted, in the first place, to erect ourselves into the assumed standard of perfection, and to condemn or approve others in proportion as they recede from or approach so unfair a test: but let us reason together upon the subject for a while, divested, as far as we can divest ourselves, of bias, and, as friendly labourers in the great work of human freedom, examine briefly our respective theories, and in the result hold fast to that which shall appear to be good.

In the outset, and, if you please, in the abstract, we shall probably all agree without argument to these propositions :

1. Whatever tends to degrade the condition of the coloured population, tends to excuse slavery.
2. Whatever tends to excuse slavery, tends to confirm it.

3. Whatever contributes to confirm slavery, partially or generally, is incompatible with our avowed creed, and opposed to the natural rights of man.

4. Whatever diverts the current of the public mind from its direction against slavery, weakens that moral influence by which it must eventually be abolished.

Now, what are the principles, the fundamental principles of colonization? They are declared in the constitution to be exclusively directed to promote and execute a plan for colonizing (with their consent) the free people of colour residing in our country, in Africa, &c. All this in itself is unobjectionable, but it is unobjectionable because it is virtually inoperative. If the free will not go, it can clearly do no good, according to the views of its founders; and if the free will go, it may do harm, according to the views of the abolitionist, as respects those who remain enslaved.

We apprehend that in the application of those principles, injustice will often be done. Every measure, as has been intimated, that is founded upon admitted inferiority of natural right in the African, is calculated to degrade him, and bring him nearer to the foot of the oppressor. Emancipation upon the condition of exile is no emancipation at all; it is merely the alternative of two evils; it is, if Liberia be the sepulchre it is represented to be, a decision between slavery and death; these are terms which we are not privileged to propose, and to which the coloured population are not bound to submit. The inequality of natural rights supposed to justify this course, does not in fact exist, and the measure itself is utterly opposed to the principles of the government under which we live. Such measures furnish a specious but corrupt argument in favour of the continuance of slavery, from rendering that apparently a matter of option, which at best is but a choice

between equal evils—we offer to them freedom if they will take banishment with it ; we exempt them from imprisonment if they will submit to transportation. I do not say that this is the language adopted towards them, but it is the essence—the result of those provisions ostensibly designed for their benefit. Whence do we derive authority for these propositions? No where. What expediency is there in its exercise? None. If the inducements to go to Liberia be sufficiently strong, they will not require the aid either of actual or constructive force. If subserviency to the white population, even in a state of freedom, render their condition irksome, it is well that avenues should be opened for their exportation to other climes. But we protest against compulsion, physical or moral, direct or consequential ; it is enough that they were forced amongst us—that was wrong ; it is a still *greater* wrong, having debarred them of the advantages of moral and intellectual improvement, and consigned them to darkness and misery, that we should now thrust them forth like beasts of prey to batten upon each other, to fall victims to beleaguering foes, or to a destructive climate more cruel still than they.

Further, as a means of abolition, we deny its practicability, even supposing the coloured population should be inclined to take advantage of these offers. Let us first look to the effect of the system upon those already free, and in the next place upon those whose freedom is anticipated, as the result of that system. First, then, as to the free—there are at this time in the United States five hundred thousand free blacks. There may be conveyed in a vessel of four hundred tons, with comfort and convenience, say two hundred passengers, and two voyages out and home might readily be made in the course of a year. Thus, without any allowance

for the natural increase, it would require at least one thousand years to remove this number by a single ship. This, however, we shall be told at once, is a preposterous view of the subject; that it is contemplated to remove them in twenty years. How will the calculation then run? Let us suppose that in that period the natural increase will be three hundred thousand; this, added to the present population, forms the total of eight hundred thousand, which, in order to their removal in twenty years, would require one hundred ships of the larger class to be almost unremittingly employed. Well, it may be said, the requisite number of vessels may be procured;—with adequate means undoubtedly they may. What means then are requisite; and how are they to be supplied?

Fifty dollars a head, although much less than the sum hitherto required, is admitted by the agents of the colony themselves, to be but a fair allowance for each individual conveyed to the colony. At this rate the removal of eight hundred thousand would be attended with an expense of forty millions, or two millions per annum, and of course would be utterly beyond the scope of a society already deeply involved in pecuniary difficulty in removing twenty-five hundred in twelve years.

Now all these calculations have reference to the exportation of the present free coloured population and their issue, and I apprehend it is apparent that colonization, even upon this limited scale, is a matter too impracticable and visionary to be safely relied upon. But when we come to consider the slaves for whose benefit the system was professedly designed, how stands the great account? Allowing for an increase of fifty thousand a year upon the two millions of which they now consist, upon the principles of the above cal-

culatation, the mere translation of the increase would, at the rate spoken of, furnish an additional charge of two millions and a half per annum. The weight of such responsibilities would require the shoulders of Atlas or the treasures of Cræsus to sustain it; and therefore, before it can safely be incurred, national and commensurate aid should be actually secured, and not relied upon as a mere matter of argument or hope. I agree with Captain Stewart, that the American Colonization Society is beautiful and beneficial, so far as it relates to the introduction of civilization, commerce, and Christianity into Liberia, and so far as it conduces to check the slave trade. But for the purposes proposed, it is obviously incompetent to do more than a partial good, which would result in general evil; it might succeed in removing a few thousands, and diverting the public mind by the experiment for a time; but the ulterior effect will be, that this utopian scheme, at least in its present shape, will not only impair the energies of other and more feasible experiments, but finally exploding, as it must from its own inordinate pretensions, it will render matters worse than they were found, and leave the deluded wretches who have confided in it to linger, and finally perish, in a foreign clime. Nay, the very men who have been restored to freedom, shall hereafter fall a prey to the natives of Liberia, and be a second time reduced to slavery—should they escape death.

There is another view of this subject, perhaps more favourable than my own, taken from an authority that I have already adverted to, which appears to be so clear and unanswerable as to merit our particular attention.

The United States, says its author, have about two millions of slaves, and about five hundred thousand free coloured people.

The American Colonization Society has existed for thirteen years, and has exported yearly, upon an average, about one hundred and fifty persons.

Meanwhile the natural yearly increase has been fifty-six thousand souls; and nearly a million have died in slavery!!

But it may be said this is only the beginning—more may be expected hereafter. Let us see—

The average price of transporting each individual is calculated at thirty dollars: suppose it to be reduced to twenty, and then, as fifty-six thousand must be exported yearly, in order merely to prevent increase, one million one hundred and twenty thousand dollars would be yearly requisite, simply for transportation. Where is this vast sum to come from? Or suppose it supplied; still, in the mass of crime and wretchedness, as it now exists, there would be *no decrease!* Two millions of human beings every thirty years would still be *born* and *die* in slavery!!

But perhaps you wish to extinguish the crime in thirty years.

Then you must begin by transporting at least one hundred thousand yearly. In order to do this, you must have an annual income of upwards of two millions of dollars, and if you have not only to transport, but also to purchase, you would probably want, yearly, *twenty millions* more!!

Where are you to get this?

Or suppose it got,—and still one generation would perish in their wretchedness; two millions of immortal souls—plundered by you of the most sacred rights of human nature; of rights *always the same*, and everlastingly *inalienable*, however plundered—would have perished *unredressed*, and gone to confront you at the bar of God.

And will He not make inquisition for blood? And what will it avail you to say, "Oh, we satisfied ourselves, and traversed land and sea, and spent thousands to satisfy others, that if we transported a few hundreds or thousands of our oppressed fellow subjects to a distant country, yearly, with care, we might guiltlessly leave the remaining hundreds of thousands, or the millions, in slavery, and harmlessly indulge the invincible repugnance which we felt to a coloured skin. We really thought it better to exile our coloured brethren from their native country, or to render their lives in it intolerable by scorn, should they obstinately persist in remaining in it;—we really thought this better than humbling ourselves before our brother and our God, and returning to both with repenting and undissembling love."

The Abolition Society further objects to colonization, in addition to its impracticability—First, that the system is unfavourable to liberty, because, among other things, it originated with slave-holders, and has been principally sustained by them. This, in itself, is not the ground of objection, but it is viewed as evidence that the objects of the Society are tainted, or tinged with the principles of mancipation. What think you, my friends; does it not look a little questionable, that those, who are for a great part practical slave-holders, should theoretically support this system of emancipation, which is said to be total in its effects, while other systems are alleged to be necessarily partial, and consequently imperfect? If slave-holders oppose, as is said, partial emancipation, as contemplated by one society, is it probable that they would support total emancipation as proposed by another? In other words, would they prefer what to them must appear to be the greater evil to the less? This is neither reasonable



nor natural ; and it is therefore in vain to tell us, that the principle upon which their fealty and adherence are founded, is not that which inclines them to the belief, that the result will be the transportation of the free, and the consequent increased value of the slaves who shall remain ; and the diminution of the strength of those arguments which are brought to bear against this crying curse, from the vast accumulation of blacks among them.

Their objection to free blacks is every where manifest ; manifested by laws prohibiting their residence in the different slave states, or providing for their expulsion ; and this disposition is in perfect accordance with their desire to relieve themselves by colonization. But it is said that they have promised to emancipate their slaves provided they shall be sent out of the country. There have been but few practical proofs of the sincerity of this pledge ; and it will not do in matters of great national concern to rest upon doubtful pledges, or upon engagements that are not entirely obligatory. Those already free are to be transported, to make room for the exercise of benevolence in the liberation of others who are now slaves. But where is your guarantee ; who shall compel the performance of the engagement—an engagement that depends upon too many conditions and contingencies to be rationally calculated upon ? First, the free are to go, to sacrifice themselves to the prospect of a probable benefit to those of their race that shall remain. How many loop-holes are there, or will there be, for an escape from such an obligation as this, for those whose imaginary pecuniary interest may incline them to escape ? Unless the emigration of the free be compelled—which never ought to be, and consistently with the character of the government never can be—from the spirit displayed by the

blacks, it never can become very considerable. Here then is an omission to perform a condition precedent, and the reciprocal contract is abandoned or despised. It will be said that until the free are gone, no obligation rests upon them to enfranchise others: and even if some charitable or honourable men may act up to the spirit of their compact, the radical evil still remains, and grows more luxuriantly from a few of its decayed branches having been lopped off.

The difference between the opposing societies I understand then to be this:—the Colonization Society propose abolishing slavery, by exporting the free blacks at an immense expense to Liberia, which is represented as an El Dorado or Oasis. The Abolition and Anti-Slavery Societies contend for the right of the free blacks to exercise their own views upon this subject, and assume as the basis of their institutions the natural equality of man. They oppose the colonizationists inasmuch as they consider that their doctrines operate to cicatrize rather than heal the wounds inflicted by slavery—

“While rank corruption, mining all within,  
Affects unseen.”

That they at most relieve the country from a portion of the evil, but render that which remains more oppressive and interminable. That they relieve the slaveholders more than they relieve the slave, and thereby take from the force of that argument, which the fears and anxieties of the south are calculated to supply.

The strongest objection, however, to colonization is, that it is but an illusion, captivating if you will, but utterly too visionary to be productive of salutary consequence. If their professions be true, they can do no good, while they actually, as has been said, promote the mischief complained of. If untrue, they deserve no

countenance or support. If the object be to remove the free only who shall incline to go, the answer is every where given that the free do not incline to go; and that, therefore, the immense expenditure incurred is entirely misappropriated. If the object be to coerce the free, and certainly that is not directly avowed, then I answer, first, they have no right to do so; that they promote the very cause which they affect to deprecate by doing so; and that they also violate the sanctity of the laws and the character of the government by the attempt. To redeem the captives their business is with slaves and their holders. They have no more right to expel a free negro than a free white man; they have no right to banish even a felon from this land of his birth or adoption. It results, therefore, in this, that upon the principles avowed, they can do nothing; upon the practice contemplated, they would do wrong, and therefore in neither ought we to concur.

I say upon the practice contemplated they would do wrong; whence do we infer that intended practice? Let us go to the fountain head, and allow them to speak for themselves. It is ungenerous and unjust to adopt the views of their adversaries, in expounding their designs, and therefore it is that upon this inquiry I ask your attention to those of their friends as delivered in the city of Washington, at the sixteenth annual meeting of the Society.

The Honourable Mr. Chambers of Maryland says, in reference to this institution, "The Society interferes in no way with the rights or interests of owners of slaves; its sole and single object is the colonization of the free, and with their free consent." If this be so, as I have said, the Society is a farce; as it contemplates only doing that which every coloured man by his own

unassisted will can defeat; or by his own act can effectuate, without the aid of others.

Mr. Williams of North Carolina thus explicitly expresses himself:—"In many portions of the southern country, it is alleged that the ultimate object of the Society is to abolish the tenure by which persons of colour are held to labour. This allegation, sir, is unfounded. It is not true that the Society, either at its formation or at any stage of its progress since, has ever been actuated by such a design. I happened to be present when the first preliminary meeting of the Society was held in this city. I heard the chairman who then presided (now a distinguished member from Kentucky in the Senate of the United States), declare the several objects for which the Society was to be formed. I heard at the same time a distinguished member of the house of representatives from Virginia repeat the declaration, and reiterate the objects with great minuteness. In all this, not a word was said about abrogating the tenure of property in persons of colour. So far from it, it was distinctly stated, on the contrary, that with questions of this sort the Society *had nothing to do*; that the operations of the Society were not to begin until all questions in regard to slavery had ceased, or been finally determined. When the one ended, the other commenced, so as not to produce conflict or opposition of any kind whatsoever." If this be true, these are no true friends of abolition—but its most decided and inveterate foes.

G. W. Parke Custis, Esq. speaks still more openly. "It may be said, he remarks, it is cruel to take these people from their native country, across the Atlantic wave;—have they not a right to stay here? Sir, they have no right to the white man's country. True, they

have been deeply wronged, and let us restore them to the land from whence they came. There they may be masters; the land, the government will be theirs. Let them plough the ocean, till the soil, or explore the forest. Be it so. I shall envy not, but rather rejoice in their prosperity. But here there is no footing for the coloured man. If he could be happy here—if he could be placed upon a level with others—he might stay; but here he can shine but by borrowed light. Let him go then where he may rule alone.”

Now, this looks vastly like a threat—“a close denotement, working from the heart which *prudence* could not rule;” and we beg leave to say to Mr. George Washington Parke Custis, that it is a mere *brutum fulmen*—the thunder without the bolt, or the power of Jove to wield it. It shows what are their ulterior designs—it implies force, and it implies it, too, under the hypocritical guise of peace and benevolence. Mr. Custis is a Virginian—he is nothing the worse for that; he is a connexion of the greatest man that ever lived in the tide of time, and who, by the last act of his life, restored all his slaves to freedom—he is the better for *that*; but as an advocate for the freedom of the blacks, his practice and theory being opposed, he is a legitimate object of distrust, even if his views were more skilfully concealed: but from such expressions as these, I hold it to be an outrage upon common sense to urge upon us the belief that moral, if not physical force, is not to be applied for the purpose of effectuating the object of the Society, and, paradoxical as it may seem, compelling a consent. He denies their right to stay in this country; how does this accord with the assertion that they are not bound to go? He alleges that there is no footing here for the free coloured man; but that, as he has been wronged by being brought here, he shall

be righted—by being banished after his life and energies have been wasted. It seems our southern friends are the only arbiters of happiness, although we have been taught to believe that in this respect no man could perfectly judge for another; modern improvements, it seems, have utterly exploded that doctrine. The African was comparatively happy in his own clime; ranging in his native freedom, and encountering only the natural enemies of man, the wild beasts of the forest. We tell him he is mistaken in this. Slavery in a civilized and free land—with the boasted declaration of independence as its charter—that, forsooth, is a condition far preferable to his imaginary freedom at home;—he cannot believe it; but he is brought against his consent, pirated across the ocean, and taught, under the lash of merciless masters, those surpassing advantages which at home he could not be brought to comprehend. It is in vain that he urges the ties of the human heart which have been severed. It is in vain that he appeals to the feelings of husbands, of parents, and of children: his savage executioner is his judge; and in a foreign clime he sinks into the grave, the last pillow of repose to the wretched, or he wears away his existence in cruel, cheerless and unremitting toil, until at last, in his old age, or rendered prematurely decrepid by barbarity, (in the language of Mr. Williams,) his slavery ends in the desire to escape from the burthen of his future support; and slavery having ended, colonization begins. He is now torn from his adopted, as formerly from his native country; and when he plaintively urges the privileges of a freeman, and asks only for a little earth for charity, to be permitted to lay his bones where he had wasted his health and his youth, he is told he is no judge of his own comfort; he has no right to the white man's country; that there is here no foot-

ing for the coloured man (if free); that he cannot be placed upon a level with others; that he only shines in reflected light; and that, in order that he may shine in original lustre, and rule alone, he must go to Liberia and die. Admirable consistency—unparalleled philanthropy!

The latitude of this reasoning is entirely too far south for our northern comprehension;—and Mr. Custis will give us leave to observe, that, in promulging such doctrine, whatever he may know of Liberia, to say nothing of the head, he would seem to know but little of the human heart, and still less of human rights.

We should certainly have thought better of this cause without any attempt at disguise. The cloven foot from beneath the priestly robe, shocks and appals us. There is something magnanimous and imposing in boldly avowing our views; but among the various modes of carving out our path to fame, I know of none by stealth.

Yet Dr. Hodgkin of London, a late champion in the lists, still appears to consider it wonderful that the charge of compulsory removal should ever have been made against the Society. Compulsory removal!—do not let us quarrel about words. We do not mean to say that direct physical force will be applied, or, in other language, that they are to be borne away as they were borne hither; but there is a moral coercion that spreads undivided, operates unspent upon its objects—that is all pervading, and infinitely more powerful, because infinitely more insidious, than if it made its approaches under the crimson banner of open and destructive war. An avowed invasion upon the rights of two millions of our fellow-citizens never would be tolerated, never could be endured by a civilized community; the whole world would lift up her hands against it, and its first footstep would be marked in blood. But who shall re-

sist a covert foe? The gallant Trojans repelled the warlike Greeks throughout a protracted siege of ten years; and Troy *yet* had stood, had not hypocrisy and stratagem accomplished what declared hostility never could achieve. The Grecian horse, presented by Agamemnon to his adversaries, was not more ruinous or fatal to the hopes of Troy, than the introduction of this illusory and fallacious project, into the very palladium of liberty, may finally prove to our own.

But we are told this course is essential to conciliate the South. Heaven forbid that any feud should be created or promoted between us; we sympathise with, we suffer with our southern brethren; we feel the affliction of the curse as well as they; we feel it doubly, because it is sharpened by the consciousness of our having deserved it. We will adopt with them any measure calculated to result in a radical cure of the evil, but we cannot patiently look on while moral or political empirics are applying their nostrums and panaceas to a wide spread cancer, that at this moment shoots its destructive fibres into the very heart of the government.

This is no controversy for compromise, it is a struggle of principle, and it is infinitely better that we ourselves should change our free condition for that of bondmen, than voluntarily sacrifice those conscientious scruples, without the enjoyment of which life is a burthen, and the world a waste. I am aware of the prejudices of the South; and as the result of habit and education, to say nothing of necessity, I consider them comparatively excusable: but if prejudices derive something like excuse from these circumstances, how much stronger are their claims, when founded upon sound policy, pure morality, enlarged philanthropy, and the divine principles of religion?

But it is said, "What, will you sacrifice the liberty



and lives, the peace and prosperity of ten millions of freemen and of Christians, to ensure the welfare of two millions of slaves?" I answer, No; but we are not to be terrified into the belief of its being necessary to embrace this hideous alternative: and if such consequences could possibly result from such a course of policy, why is the argument addressed to us? We encroach not upon the privileges of others—we invite not the crimson waves of warfare to our shores;—we contend with our southern brethren only in affliction; we ask them to concur with us in an effort for our common safety, our common happiness; to join with us and perform a solemn lustration for our national crimes, to propitiate the avenging wrath of an offended heaven! This, it is true, is the voice of morality and religion; but we are told that, in some instances, every thing should give place to political expediency, and, although it is admitted that slavery is an evil, and as such all men are bound, at least morally, to suppress it, yet, if a greater evil would be produced by the entire and immediate emancipation of slaves than by retaining them in bondage, neither morality nor religion requires their emancipation. Suppose it were so, still that *greater* evil remains to be shown.

It will be observed, that in these remarks little or nothing has been said of Liberia, nor has it been denied that colonization, with proper modifications, may prove beneficial. Liberia may be the paradise represented by some, or the pandemonium described by others; whatever it is cannot affect this question, if the measures proposed be impracticable, or the consequence of reducing them to practice should be the perpetuation of slavery in the United States. As a benefit to the free, if they choose, without coercive influence, to embrace it, it is open to them, and as freemen let them go. Or if

the holders of slaves desire to release themselves from the alleged incumbrance, by transporting them to Liberia or elsewhere, under the sanction and protection of the government, and with adequate assurance of security and comfort, that, if reduced to the shape of an obligatory compact between the slave holding states and the nation, would be entitled to some regard. But where, we ask again, is the compact? Where the security here? Why, it consists in mutual pledges between members of the same society, that never can be enforced, and ought not therefore to be relied upon. In technical language, we shall both perform the condition of the bond and suffer the forfeiture,—we shall send off the free, and still retain the slaves. This may be colonization, but it is not abolition, either immediate or gradual; and the free coloured man who will so far trample upon the sympathies of the human heart, as to exercise that freedom to rivet the fetters of bondage upon his degraded and deserted brother, deserves himself to be a slave.

So far as the experiment has been made, let us, however, sustain our friends in it. Let us not permit two thousand of our fellow creatures to languish in disease or want, from our opposition to those principles in which they at least may have confided. How horrible would it be that the colonists at this time in Liberia should now be deserted or abandoned, without the means of competent assistance, of medical aid, of salutary government, or of available protection against the natives. What testimony shall they bear against us at the last great day, if to gratify our favourite theories, or to bring those of others into disrepute, we quietly look upon their death-struggles without the disposition or effort to relieve them? This must not be. At the last meeting of the Colonization Society at Washington,

intimations of an abandonment of the entire scheme were thrown out, by one of its most distinguished members. What *then* shall be the fate of those who remain at the colony, cut off from all aid, condemned to prey upon each other by actual and sad necessity, and jointly exposed to the incursions and barbarity of the natives? Where shall they seek for refuge? Where shall they flee from despair? Nought but that arm which alone can fathom the depths of the sea, governed by that spirit that sways the empire of Christian hearts, can minister relief in calamities like these. If, then, we are true to the faith we profess, let us not desert them in their extremest need, but magnanimously step forth, not to support broadly the principles of colonization, but to protect a body of deluded or deceived men from the dreadful consequence of their own temerity or folly, and to vindicate the country against the foul reproach of having sacrificed whole hecatombs of human beings, for the purpose of gratifying an unthinking and overweening desire of founding a *new* republic, instead of improving the *old*.

It is understood that, by individual contributions among some benevolent ladies in this city, arrangements have been made for the instruction of those who have already expatriated themselves. This effort is worthy of its authors, and, without doubt, will be attended with great advantages. Education, we admit, is the best colonization; it can do no possible harm in any result, and its obvious tendency is to do good. Without it, though prosperous in all other respects, the colonists would soon sink into savage hordes, and finally only be distinguished from the natives by all the vices, without any of the virtues or restraints of civilization. Nevertheless, these charitable ladies must excuse us for thinking, that if the vast sums thus expended

were appropriated to the moral and intellectual improvement of the coloured population in the United States, they would at least prove as effective in their beneficial results as the measures thus adopted. The better instructed mankind may be, the better qualified will they become for good citizens, and the feebleness, consequently, will be the objections urged against them. Missionary societies of every beneficial description are to be encouraged; but, although the heart should not be checked in the exercises of its generous impulses, towards whatever quarter of the globe they may be directed, still, the doctrine that charity begins at home, is not to be entirely despised, and, in the present instance, is peculiarly entitled to regard.

I have, as has been intimated, been kindly furnished by all these societies with every document calculated to exhibit their respective claims to support. I have cursorily read them all, with an anxious desire to obtain correct impressions, and to arrive at the conclusion that these institutions might harmonize with each other; and so, by a judicious adaptation, they possibly may still; but it cannot surely be denied that they are founded in principles diametrically opposed to each other. This opposition will naturally weaken both, unless moderated and relieved by mutual charity and forbearance. At the same time that we shrink from the results of colonization, we cannot approve the severity of remark by which it has been assailed. Sound principles reject such aid as this; persecution strengthens the persecuted and enfeebles the persecutor. We must not forget that many of those with whom we differ are actuated by an honest, though misdirected zeal—carried away by magnificent notions of establishing a colony, and handing down their names to an immortal fame; that they are so far dazzled by the glory of the experiment,

so far blinded by the excess of light, as to be incapable for a time of properly estimating the utility or practicability of the project. They are upright and intelligent men, however, and cannot long be deceived; the delusion past, the current of their thoughts will carve out a new channel; they will return again to the true faith, and lend the mighty aid of their untiring perseverance to the *immediate emancipation* of the body and mind, the souls and sinews of their enslaved fellow creatures. *Immediate emancipation!*—unlucky phrase, another fruitful theme of contention; this is said to be altogether chimerical and fallacious, and we must agree that it is so—as our opponents understand it. But do not let us, I repeat it, differ about words; it is unworthy of men engaged in so liberal and so hallowed a pursuit. Let us strike out the term immediate, or explain it. I understand it to be used in opposition to the terms prospective or gradual, implying that the present time is ever the time for efficiently encountering vice; that it is succoured and strengthened by indulgence; and that, although no man is so visionary as to expect an instantaneous and total eradication of the mischief, yet the efforts must be immediate, and directed to immediate results, in order, eventually, to secure entire success. Gradual emancipation will be the consequence; but there is a vast difference between gradual emancipation and the adoption of gradual means to procure it. If the natural and gradual increase of slavery be encountered only by a gradual and proportional diminution of slaves, the account will stand open until the end of time, and we shall leave it to an awful eternity to strike the balance; but if, as in the present instance, the reaction be inferior to the action, the crime must obviously continue to increase and extend itself, until the period of a horrible retribution

shall arrive. What a wretched and delusive policy is that which postpones the resistance of infant evil, under an idea of subduing it with greater ease in its maturity of growth. In point of right, and, we contend, in point of expediency, the slaves throughout the world are, at this moment, entitled to liberation; yet years, perhaps centuries, must necessarily pass ere that right will be universally acknowledged, or enforced by legislation; and that, too, in despite of the most strenuous, concentrated and immediate efforts that can be brought to bear upon this object. But if those efforts are to be diverted, distracted or delayed; if we are to amuse ourselves with new projects, the enemy daily and hourly gains strength, until, in the accumulation of its own venom, it finally shall burst and poison the very atmosphere we breathe. It is said, however, by our carrying off the natural increase of the slave population, that the friendly hand of Death will, in time, perform the rest by destroying those who remain; this is true, if the increase, strictly so called, be removed; but the misfortune of the argument is, that in all human probability, and this matter must be adjusted by the scale of probability, the old, and infirm, and useless, will be, for the most part, manumitted, and that hence slavery will still flourish amongst us in immortal youth and vigour.

In all that has been said, we have taken for granted the natural equality of man. I confess, I can hardly bring myself to discuss a proposition so entirely plain. I speak of equality of fundamental rights, not of intellectual power—not of complexion. If the grade of intellect is to be the test of freedom, it is at least unfairly applied to those whom we have deprived of the opportunities of improvement. The very institution founded by Wilberforce at Clapham, though upon a limited scale, afforded an abundant refutation of the doctrine of in-

tellectual inferiority. But were it otherwise, what is more liable to the influence of external circumstances than the intellect of man? Deprive him of the inspirations of ambition, of hope, of health, of standing among his brethren of the earth, and what remains as an incentive to mental improvement? What husbandman incurs the toil of seed time and culture, except with a view to the subsequent enjoyment of a golden harvest? But, even adopting the doctrine of intellectual inequality, it does not rest here; we must carry it further in its application. Thousands among us who hail the annual return of the birth-day of liberty, must, upon their own principles, submit again to be shackled, and to bow down before a few choice and master spirits of the age.

If complexion, "the shadowed livery of a burnished sun," is to be the criterion, the ladies will eventually prove the only sovereigns in the land, for they are always fair; and theirs, in truth, is the only despotism to which man can honourably submit. The Indian, the Hindoo, the Chinese, the Tartar,—the freest of the free—upon this rule must all be doomed to bondage; and, inverting the philosophy of the gentle Desdemona, instead of seeing Othello's visage in his mind, we shall see his mind in his face. This is preposterous, and I discard it as utterly unworthy of enlightened men. But, it is said, certainly you would not place them upon a social equality with the whites? We answer, No. That never can be; the iron hand of slavery will still leave its traces upon them; their degraded condition, even after their fetters are broken, will still impose upon them the chains of prejudice; yet their lot, though humble and pitiable, will nevertheless be comparatively blessed. Would you marry them to the whites? This is a flimsy argument, addressed still to our prejudices, and proving, by the existence of those very prejudices, the absurdity

of the suggestion. How ridiculous it is to summon up bugbears like these, to “sickly o’er the native hue of resolution,” and to alarm our pride and our selfishness, by extravagant notions that never can be realized. No principle can be so sound and salutary, but, by being carried to an extreme, may be rendered utterly *insane* and pernicious.

Who, for instance, would not revolt, as from contamination, at the idea of a matrimonial alliance with an avowed felon, or with the lawless savage of the forest? Yet this does not disparage them on the scale of natural rights:—or, passing again from morals to intellect, who would not shrink from a union with a proverbial fool? Yet this does not take from him the privileges of a freeman. Who would marry his daughter—or rather, what daughter would marry a footman or a scullion, though his visage were as fair as Dian’s? All these propositions appear monstrous to our pride or our prejudices, yet never have been admitted to be so monstrous as to be urged as arguments in favour of enslaving those with whom we should be disinclined to be united in the silken bond of love. Restore them, then, to their freedom. Talk no more of their sable complexions, but look to the complexions of your own hearts—purify your own consciences by a solemn sacrifice for national iniquity, and leave the consequences to an Almighty hand. “Who has ever known the righteous man forsaken, or his children seeking bread?” Do you fear more to do good than to do evil; or do you suppose that the penalties of guilt will be alleviated by the accumulation of crime? Do you expect to exhaust the thunder of Omnipotence, by still adding to the cruelties inflicted upon his creatures, and thereby challenge impunity for the vices yet to come?—depend upon it—I speak with authority and in a warning



voice—if you would flee from the wrath to come, now, now is the accepted time—this is the day of salvation.

I despise the man that dares to build an argument in favour of this nefarious traffic upon the difference in complexion. I abhor him who would impiously attempt to derive authority from heaven itself for this earthly abomination. The devil, it is true, can cite scripture for his purpose—but that *man* should venture to arraign the decrees of Providence, or to render them subservient to the purposes and gratification of selfishness or iniquity, is to pronounce his own condemnation, in the voice of that very authority to which he appeals for excuse.

The result of these hasty and imperfect suggestions is, that in its present shape, colonization is inexpedient, and that the solemn protest of Wilberforce, “the moral Washington of Africa,” in his last hour, tends to show that nothing in life became him more than the manner of his death. Like the golden sun that has sunk beneath the western horizon, he has sunk into the grave, life’s dark and inevitable horizon, but still throws upon the world which he sustained and enlightened in his career, the reflected beams of his departed glory.

In conclusion, let me enjoin it upon you all to be charitable to one another; do not allow dissention to raise her horrible crest between you. If essentially your objects be the same, though not co-extensive with each other, move hand-in-hand upon your journey so far as you keep company, and let no trifling bickerings or jealousies mar your peace, enfeeble your joint efforts, and thereby render you an easy prey to the active and vigilant enemies of this righteous cause. Union alone is strength, and when it can be preserved without a sacrifice of principle, it is your duty to secure it. Differ

not about the mere outward limbs and flourishes of the various philanthropic societies to which you are attached, if they be right at heart. Indulge not in vituperation and insult towards each other; it is not only calculated to breed ill blood among you, but it is utterly unworthy of your sacred calling—totally inconsistent with the mild, the liberal and benignant spirit by which you profess to be actuated. However objectionable colonization may be in its present aspect, and it certainly is objectionable, if by a proper modification it can be rendered serviceable to you, or rather to those whose rights you advocate, do not obstinately reject its advantages. Recollect, you are accountable to a Supreme Power, not only for the zeal you display in behalf of suffering humanity, but for the lights of knowledge which you possess, and the judgment you shall exercise under their influence. We deery prejudice and inconsistency upon the one side, let us avoid them upon the other. And, finally, let us beseech the Great Source of all Good to preside over our councils, and direct us to such results as may be most conducive to the benefit of our fellow-creatures, to our own eternal salvation, and to the glory of His Almighty name.

THE END.



